

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-2095

BRETT DAVIS; BRIAN CHRIS SMOOT; STEVE SZYMECZEK,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

v.

CITY OF GREENSBORO, North Carolina,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 15-2096

WENDY CHEEK; BRIAN KEITH COLLINS; JOSEPH CASEY COUNCILMAN;
WALTER STEVEN COUTURIER; TIMOTHY FIELDS; WILLIAM C. MORGAN,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

v.

CITY OF GREENSBORO, NORTH CAROLINA,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 16-2097

MICHAEL BROWNELL; TRAYVEAWN GOODWIN; CHRISTIAN HICKS; TY
JENKS; PATRICK KENNEDY; GEORGE SIMMONS,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

v.

CITY OF GREENSBORO, NORTH CAROLINA,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 16-2098

DAVID MORGAN; ROGERS REYNOLDS,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

v.

CITY OF GREENSBORO, NORTH CAROLINA,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. Catherine C. Eagles, District Judge. (1:12-cv-00888-CCE-JEP; 1:12-cv-00981-CCE-JEP; 1:12-cv-01311-CCE-JEP; 1:12-cv-01110-CCE-JEP)

Submitted: June 27, 2016

Decided: July 28, 2016

Before MOTZ and KING, Circuit Judges, and DAVIS, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

William L. Hill, Torin L. Fury, FRAZIER HILL & FURY, RLLP, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellants. Kenneth Kyre, Jr., Danielle N. Godfrey, PINTO COATES KYRE & BOWERS, PLLC, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

The Appellants, current and retired police officers and firefighters for the City of Greensboro, appeal the district court's orders granting summary judgment in favor of the City on the Appellants' claims related to the City's reduction and termination of a longevity pay program and the City's failure to provide retirement benefits for off-duty work performed by police officers. We review de novo a district court's order granting summary judgment, viewing facts in the light most favorable to the nonmoving party. Newport News Holdings Corp. v. Virtual City Vision, Inc., 650 F.3d 423, 434 (4th Cir. 2011). A court must grant summary judgment "if the movant shows that there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law." Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a). "[T]here is no issue for trial unless there is sufficient evidence favoring the nonmoving party for a jury to return a verdict for that party.'" Newport News, 650 F.3d at 434 (quoting Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 249 (1986)).

We have thoroughly reviewed the record and conclude that the district court did not err in granting summary judgment for the City on the claims challenged on appeal. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's orders. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately

presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid in the decisional process.

AFFIRMED